

MAR 17 2006

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

COY PHELPS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

MARILYN PATEL; et al.,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 05-15578

D.C. No. CV-02-02504-PJH

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of California
Phyllis J. Hamilton, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted March 8, 2006**

Before: CANBY, BEEZER, and KOZINSKI, Circuit Judges.

Federal prisoner Coy Phelps appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his Bivens action alleging that a federal judge, an assistant United States Attorney, the United States Attorney and two probation officers

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

violated his civil rights. We have jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo, *Mullis v. United States Bankr. Court*, 828 F.2d 1385, 1388 (9th Cir. 1987), and we affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Phelps's claims against United States District Judge Patel as barred by judicial immunity. *See id.*

The district court also properly dismissed Phelps's claims against the United States Attorney and an assistant United States Attorney as barred by prosecutorial immunity. *See Imbler v. Pachtman*, 424 U.S. 409, 431 (1976).

Phelps's claims against the two probation officers are barred by quasi-judicial immunity. *See Demoran v. Witt*, 781 F.2d 155, 157-58 (9th Cir. 1986).

AFFIRMED.